

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Independent claims 1, 13 and 24 are amended. As Radhakrishnan does not teach a system that employs a negative acknowledge scheme as part of its logic to flush packet data units in addition to other reasons to delete or flush packet data units and MAC layer signals, it is believed that each of the independent claims overcome the grounds of rejection and are allowable. Thus, the grounds of rejection are considered moot in relation to the dependent claims as well.

Further the applicant notes that Radhakrishnan states in col. 7, lls 23-30:

*If the sequence number is within the window 402, the ARQ processing proceeds to a step 606 where the send moves the lower boundary of the window from its current value of  $F(t)$  to a new value of  $F(r)$ , i.e.,  $F(t)$  is updated to be  $F(r)$ . The packets between the window's old boundary and new boundary have been implicitly acknowledged by the receiver as being correctly received.*

The official action uses this text as support for the limitation of “*deleting a group of stored MAC layer signals after a specified period has elapsed since receiving a negative acknowledge signal*”.

As the claim is constituted, PDUs are flushed or deleted after a specified period if a negative-acknowledge signal (N-ACK) has not been received. The quoted text, however, seems to suggest that if a sequence number of a received acknowledge is within a window 402 (that includes un-acknowledged sequence numbers, the window of 400 is changed to that sequence number location in the buffer. This effectively, the list of acknowledged and unacknowledged sequence numbers is changed based on determining that the sequence number is within buffer 402 and its unacknowledged status can be changed (and the preceding sequence numbers as well). The claim, however, requires deleting the MAC layer signals without receiving an acknowledge and without receiving a N-ACK. Thus, Radhakrishnan does not teach what the claim requires.

Each of the remaining claims are modified accordingly.

It is believed that the foregoing amendment places the Application in condition for allowance; therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-17, 19-22 and 24-26 as set forth in paragraph 6 of the Office Action, and

full allowance of same. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact please contact James Harrison at (214) 902-8100.

Respectfully submitted,

GARLICK HARRISON & MARKISON

Dated: March 17, 2008

/James A. Harrison/Reg. No. 40,401

James A. Harrison

Garlick Harrison & Markison  
P. O. Box 160727  
Austin, TX 78716-0727  
Voice: (214) 902-8100  
Fax: (214) 902-8101